



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,181	12/15/2003	Anju Tandon	2348.0030000	4379
53636 7590 04/29/2008 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX, P.L.L.C. 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3934				
EXAMINER GOYEA, OLUSEGUN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
4176				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/29/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/736,181

Applicant(s)

TANDON ET AL.

Examiner

OLUSEGUN GOYEA

Art Unit

4176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12/15/2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20060417
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a. Steps 302 and 304 in fig. 3 are disclosed in reverse order in paragraph 0044.Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claims 8 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 8 and 25 contains the trademark/trade name JAVA. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe

standardized template and programming instructions and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 4-6, 10-13, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fiascone et al (US 2005/0114239 – hereinafter referred to as Fiascone).

6. Referring to claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11 and 12, Fiascone discloses a system for reconciling financial transaction comprising:

transmitting a standardized template for entering financial data to a plurality of remote terminals, the standardized template operable on a plurality of operating systems; (see, fig. 4 and 5)

receiving remote financial data from the plurality of remote terminals via the standardized template; (see, paragraph 0019)

matching the remote financial data to master financial data; (see, paragraph 0023)

identifying an un-reconciled amount based on said matching; (see, paragraph 0024)

and generating a report including the un-reconciled amount. (see, paragraph 0025)

updating a balance sheet based on the un-reconciled amount

wherein the master financial data is stored in a first format and at least one of the remote terminals stores remote financial data in a second format. (see, paragraph 0020-0021)

said standard template for converting the remote financial data from the second format to the first format. (see, paragraph 0021)

said standardized template further comprising: a plurality of predefined templates for entering financial data. (see, figure 4)

maintaining identification data of users authorized to enter the remote financial data. (see, paragraph 0026)

Regarding claims 1, the examiner interprets a standardized template as a webpage or web browser which is operable on a plurality of operating systems. The webpage or web browser can contain subsections of predefined templates for entering specific information. Although Fiascone does not explicitly disclose transmitting the standardized and customized templates, it is inherent that accessing the system will involve transmitting the web browser or webpage and its content from the system to the remote terminals.

Referring to claim 13, Fiascone discloses a system for reconciling financial accounts, comprising:

receiving transaction data from a remote terminal, the transaction data stored in a first format by the remote terminal and converted to a standardized format by a standardized template; (see, paragraph 0019 and 0021)

reconciling a financial account corresponding to the transaction using master financial data stored in the standardized format; (see paragraph 0023)

identifying an un-reconciled amount corresponding to the transaction based on said reconciling, (see, paragraph 0024)

and reporting the un-reconciled amount to the remote terminal. (see paragraph 0025)

Referring to claim 16, Fiascone discloses a system for reconciling account and transaction data, comprising:

storing transaction data in a first format; (see, paragraph 0020)

converting the stored transaction data to a second format using a standardized template, the standardized template operable on a plurality of operating systems and operable to retrieve stored transaction data from a plurality of accounting software applications; (see, paragraph 0029 and paragraph 0031)

transmitting the converted transaction data in the second format to a reconciliation system; (see, paragraph 0020 and 0021)

and receiving a reconciliation report from the reconciliation system in response to said transmitting. (see, paragraph 0025)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiascone, and further in view of Crozier (US 5392390).

10. Referring to claims 2 and 3, Fiascone discloses a system for reconciling financial transaction comprising:

transmitting a standardized template for entering financial data to a plurality of remote terminals, the standardized template operable on a plurality of operating systems; (see, fig. 4 and 5)

receiving remote financial data from the plurality of remote terminals via the standardized template; (see, paragraph 0019)

matching the remote financial data to master financial data; (see, paragraph 0023)
identifying an un-reconciled amount based on said matching; (see, paragraph
0024)
and generating a report including the un-reconciled amount. (see, paragraph 0025)

11. But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose a system for reconciling financial transaction wherein:

at least two of the remote terminals use different operating systems.
at least two of the remote terminals use different accounting software
applications.

However, Crozier discloses a system for reconciling financial transaction wherein:

at least two of the remote terminals use different operating systems. (see, col. 3,
lines 27-30)
at least two of the remote terminals use different accounting software
applications. (see, col. 3, lines 22-26)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have altered the system of Fiascone so as to have included the steps of having at least two of the remote terminals use different operating systems and accounting software applications, in accordance with the teaching of Crozier, in order to have extended the capability and use of the system, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiascone, and further in view of Randall et al. (US 20030229541- hereinafter referred to as Randall).

12. Referring 7, Fiascone discloses a system for reconciling financial transaction comprising:

transmitting a standardized template for entering financial data to a plurality of remote terminals, the standardized template operable on a plurality of operating systems; (see, fig. 4 and 5)

receiving remote financial data from the plurality of remote terminals via the standardized template; (see, paragraph 0019)

matching the remote financial data to master financial data; (see, paragraph 0023)

identifying an un-reconciled amount based on said matching; (see, paragraph 0024)

and generating a report including the un-reconciled amount. (see, paragraph 0025)

13. But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose a system for reconciling financial transaction wherein:

said remote financial data including a transaction involving an account, and said master financial data including a balance due for the account

However, Randall discloses a system for reconciling financial transaction wherein:

said remote financial data including a transaction involving an account, and said master financial data including a balance due for the account. (see, paragraph 0009 and 0010)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have altered the system of Fiascone so as to have included the step wherein said remote financial data including a transaction involving an account, and said master financial data including a balance due for the account, in accordance with the teaching of Randall, in order to have extended the capability and use of the system, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

14. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiascone, and further in view of Bracken et al. (US 20050044015- hereinafter referred to as Bracken).

15. Referring to claim 8, Fiascone discloses a system for reconciling financial transaction comprising:

transmitting a standardized template for entering financial data to a plurality of remote terminals, the standardized template operable on a plurality of operating systems; (see, fig. 4 and 5)

receiving remote financial data from the plurality of remote terminals via the standardized template; (see, paragraph 0019)

matching the remote financial data to master financial data; (see, paragraph 0023)

identifying an un-reconciled amount based on said matching; (see, paragraph 0024)

and generating a report including the un-reconciled amount. (see, paragraph 0025)

16. But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose a system for reconciling financial transaction wherein:

said standardized template comprising a JAVA format

However, Bracken discloses a system for reconciling financial transaction wherein:

said standardized template comprising a JAVA format. (see, paragraph 0067)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have altered the system of Fiascone so as to have included the step of wherein said standardized template comprising a JAVA format, in accordance with the teaching of Bracken, in order to have extended the capability and use of the system, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Claims 9, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiascone, and further in view of Randall.

17. Referring to claim 9, Fiascone discloses a system for reconciling financial transaction comprising:

transmitting a standardized template for entering financial data to a plurality of remote terminals, the standardized template operable on a plurality of operating systems; (see, fig. 4 and 5)

receiving remote financial data from the plurality of remote terminals via the standardized template; (see, paragraph 0019)

matching the remote financial data to master financial data; (see, paragraph 0023)
identifying an un-reconciled amount based on said matching; (see, paragraph
0024)
and generating a report including the un-reconciled amount. (see, paragraph 0025)

18. But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose a system for reconciling financial transaction wherein:

said receiving further comprising: scheduling a time for said receiving with the
remote terminals.

However, Randall discloses a system for reconciling financial transaction wherein:

said receiving further comprising: scheduling a time for said receiving with the
remote terminals. (see, paragraph 0009)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have altered the system of Fiascone so as to have included the step of said receiving further comprising: scheduling a time for said receiving with the remote terminals, in accordance with the teaching of Randall, in order to have extended the capability and use of the system, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

19. Referring to claims 14 and 15, Fiascone discloses a system for reconciling financial accounts comprising:

receiving transaction data from a remote terminal, the transaction data stored in a first format by the remote terminal and converted to a standardized format by a standardized template; (see, paragraph 0019 and 0021)

reconciling a financial account corresponding to the transaction using master financial data stored in the standardized format; (see paragraph 0023)

identifying an un-reconciled amount corresponding to the transaction based on said reconciling, (see, paragraph 0024)

and reporting the un-reconciled amount to the remote terminal. (see paragraph 0025)

20. But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose a system for reconciling financial accounts further comprising:

receiving the transaction data at a scheduled time

receiving the transaction data during a time of the transaction.

21. However, Randall discloses a system for reconciling financial accounts further comprising:

receiving the transaction data at a scheduled time (see, paragraph 0009 and 0010)

receiving the transaction data during a time of the transaction. (see, paragraph 0009 and 0010)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have altered the system of Fiascone so as to have included the steps of receiving the transaction data during at a schedule time and time of the transaction, in accordance with the

teaching of Randall, in order to have extended the capability and use of the system, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Regarding claims 9, 14 and 15, the examiner interprets the computer configuration of Randall's system to include scheduling receiving transaction information by the host system from the transaction aggregator at scheduled times. (see, paragraph 0009)

Referring to claim 17 and 23, Fiascone discloses a system to reconcile financial data comprising:

- a master component for storing master financial data for a plurality of accounts;

- (see, paragraph 0022)

- a matching component for matching the account and transaction data with the master financial data; (see, paragraph 0023)

- a clearance component for identifying un-reconciled accounts and transactions based on the account and transaction data; (see, paragraph 0024)

- and an account component for reporting the account and transaction data. (see, paragraph 0025)

- a login component for recognizing a user. (see, paragraph 0026 and fig. 3)

But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose a system to reconcile financial data comprising:

- a capture component for receiving and storing account and transaction data from a plurality of remote terminals; (see, paragraph 0020)

However, it is obviously inherent to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, that the system of Fiascone would be capable of storing transaction data for subsequent reconciliation by the user of the remote terminals.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiascone, and further in view of Randall.

Referring to claim 18, Fiascone discloses a system to reconcile financial data comprising:

- a master component for storing master financial data for a plurality of accounts; (see, paragraph 0022)

- a capture component for receiving and storing account and transaction data from a plurality of remote terminals; (see, paragraph 0020)

- a matching component for matching the account and transaction data with the master financial data; (see, paragraph 0023)

- a clearance component for identifying un-reconciled accounts and transactions based on the account and transaction data; (see, paragraph 0024)

- and an account component for reporting the account and transaction data. (see, paragraph 0025)

But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose a system to reconcile financial data comprising:

- a schedule component for scheduling reconciliations with the remote terminals.

However Randall discloses a system to reconcile financial data comprising:

- a schedule component for scheduling reconciliations with the remote terminals. (see, paragraph 0009)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have altered the system of Fiascone so as to have included the step comprising a schedule component for scheduling reconciliations with the remote, in accordance with the teaching of Randall, in order to have extended the capability and use of the system, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

22. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiascone, and further in view of Bracken.

Referring to claim 19, 20, 21 and 22, Fiascone discloses a system to reconcile financial data comprising:

- a master component for storing master financial data for a plurality of accounts;

- (see, paragraph 0022)

- a capture component for receiving and storing account and transaction data from a plurality of remote terminals; (see, paragraph 0020)

- a matching component for matching the account and transaction data with the master financial data; (see, paragraph 0023)

- a clearance component for identifying un-reconciled accounts and transactions based on the account and transaction data; (see, paragraph 0024)

- and an account component for reporting the account and transaction data. (see, paragraph 0025)

But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose a system to reconcile financial data comprising:

a template component for providing a plurality of predefined templates for entering transaction and account data.

a plurality of functions for generating customized templates.

a user maintenance component for maintaining identification data of authorized users.

a review component for reviewing uploaded account and transaction data.

However Bracken discloses a system to reconcile financial data comprising:

a template component for providing a plurality of predefined templates for entering transaction and account data. (see, paragraph 0074)

a plurality of functions for generating customized templates. (see paragraph 0074)

a user maintenance component for maintaining identification data of authorized users. (see, paragraph 0058)

a review component for reviewing uploaded account and transaction data. (see, paragraph 0075)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have altered the system of Fiascone so as to have included: a template component for providing a plurality of predefined templates for entering transaction and account data, a plurality of functions for generating customized templates, a user maintenance component for maintaining identification data of authorized users and a review component for reviewing uploaded account and transaction data, in accordance with the teaching of Bracken, in order to

have extended the capability and use of the system, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

23. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiascone, and further in view of Crozier.

24. Referring to claim 24, Fiascone discloses a system for reconciling financial transaction comprising:

a master component for storing master financial data for a plurality of accounts;

(see, paragraph 0022)

a capture component for receiving and storing account and transaction data from a plurality of remote terminals; (see, paragraph 0020)

a matching component for matching the account and transaction data with the master financial data; (see, paragraph 0023)

a clearance component for identifying un-reconciled accounts and transactions based on the account and transaction data; (see, paragraph 0024)

and an account component for reporting the account and transaction data. (see, paragraph 0025)

But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose a system to reconcile financial data wherein each of said components comprises programming instructions that may be implemented by a plurality of computer operating systems.

However, Crozier discloses a system to reconcile financial data wherein each of said components comprises programming instructions that may be implemented by a plurality of computer operating systems. (see, col. 3 lines 22-34)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have altered the system of Fiascone so as to have included the step of wherein each of said components comprises programming instructions that may be implemented by a plurality of computer operating systems, in accordance with the teaching of Crozier, in order to have extended the capability and use of the system, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

25. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiascone, and further in view of Bracken.

26. Referring to claim 25, Fiascone discloses a system for reconciling financial transaction comprising:

- a master component for storing master financial data for a plurality of accounts;
(see, paragraph 0022)

- a capture component for receiving and storing account and transaction data from a plurality of remote terminals; (see, paragraph 0020)

- a matching component for matching the account and transaction data with the master financial data; (see, paragraph 0023)

a clearance component for identifying un-reconciled accounts and transactions based on the account and transaction data; (see, paragraph 0024) and an account component for reporting the account and transaction data. (see, paragraph 0025)

27. But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose a system for reconciling financial transaction wherein:

said standardized template comprising a JAVA format

However, Bracken discloses a system for reconciling financial transaction wherein:

said standardized template comprising a JAVA format. (see, paragraph 0067)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have altered the system of Fiascone so as to have included the step of wherein said standardized template comprising a JAVA format, in accordance with the teaching of Bracken, in order to have extended the capability and use of the system, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Conclusion

28. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Simmons (US 5093787) discloses a system for electronic checkbook with automatic reconciliation.
- Anderson (US 5327555) discloses a method for reconciling entries in a plurality of schedules.
- Provinse (US 20070112653) discloses a system and method for account reconciliation.

29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLUSEGUN GOYEA whose telephone number is (571)270-5402. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:00 to 5:00 (ET).

30. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry O'Connor can be reached on (571) 272-6787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

31. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/O. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 4176
04/16/2008

/Gerald J. O'Connor/
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 4176